HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XII, No. 30 Saturday, July 23, 1955 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

THE BOMBSHELL. The Capital greeted the Eisenhower disarmament proposal (full swap of military secrets by the U.S. and Russia) with both restrained optimism and skepticism. The optimists pointed out that the President had put the Soviets on the defensive. Some of the skeptics feared Ike's offer might be accepted by Moscow, then evaded, in exchange for vital and damaging concessions from the West. But, one of the cynical — a conservative Democratic Congressman — told us: "That's no real offer — you can't give the Soviets something they already have," meaning the Muscovites already possess knowledge of our military secrets. Still — most people here say today — it's now up to the Soviets to cap this Eisenhower move in the world propaganda battle.

Geneva — As Seen from Diplomatic Row: Whatever the Russians gained from the pourparlers on the shores of the Swiss lake, one achievement was considerable, beyond a shadow of a doubt — according to professional diplomats in the conference game who follow the reports in their chanceries along Massachusetts Avenue. This achievement has been completely ignored by all commentators and columnists in the American press.

This Soviet coup can only be perceived against the backdrop of the "conciliation" and "cordiality" deployed at Geneva. Professionals in the old game smile sadly at the extravagant emphasis which the Administration and most Americans placed on the expected effect of our "conciliatory" attitude towards Soviet Russia. President Eisenhower, with a simple but touching faith in the basic good will of Moscow Government, apparently assumed that being "conciliatory" towards his opposite numbers among the Soviet leaders will convince the Russian people of America's good faith and thereby would force the Red leaders to act in a really conciliatory way at the conference table.

Nothing could be further from the truth — say foreign diplomats. The Russian people and the subjects of the Russian satellite empire look upon the Soviet leaders who go to Geneva as their tyrants and enemies. And the latter — realizing this full well — were delighted to be able to present to their slaves a picture of the leaders of Western free nations mingling and dealing amiably with the Red masters.

Such a picture diminishes, if it does not destroy, all hopes among the oppressed masses beyond the Iron Curtain that they can, at any early date, overthrow or undermine the system which enchains them, that they can get rid of the GPU terror which is the prime factor in ensuring continuation of this slavery. In short, the potential "liberators," i.e., America, Britain, France, appeared — to the oppressed — like collaborators with the hated tyrants. Thus hope disappears. The President's disarmament proposal, it is said, does nothing to alter this unfortunate situation.

The Soviet leaders, acutely mindful of this, have therefore sought in every way to embellish their role of "friendliness" at Geneva, in news photos and in amicable poses with Eisenhower, Eden and Faure. (This was the explanation for Khrushchev's "fraternization" with Americans in the American Embassy in Moscow on July 4. Never, it is remarked, has American Independence Day been so sordidly exploited.)

This — in short — constitutes the seamy side of the silken curtain of "conciliation" through which the Soviets obviously wished the proceedings — and the diplomatic aftermath — to be viewed by their unfortunate subjects.

Geneva — Legalizing Yalta: Foreign observers here wonder anxiously what the meeting of the foreign ministers — which will take place after the Summit leaders go home — will produce. These observers are cognizant — and happily so — that the bitter disillusion of the Americans with

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yalta made our leaders determined not to make settlements at Geneva, or its aftermath, which would approximate the blunders of Roosevelt at the Yalta conference of February, 1945, when we lost the peace. What these experts hope will not happen, as the foreign ministers huddle, is that, under the guise of "maintaining peace," something like a "legalizing of Yalta" may emerge.

They figure it this way. They recall the Versailles Conference of 1919 when the winners of World War I imposed a victors' peace on the vanquished — a highly unrestful peace. They recall that by 1925 "something had to be done" and it was done at Locarno, Italy, in a big conference. There European diplomats sought to quell the resentments inspired by the Versailles Conference. Actually not too much was accomplished save to spread the "spirit of Locarno," which was indeed highly cordial. French Premier Herriot and German Premier Stresemann linked arms and fraternized amicably. But the boundaries of Versailles were largely left unchanged. In a sense, the Versailles settlement was temporarily "legalized" by the Locarno conferees and a European breathing spell was achieved. But ere long, another European crisis arose, bringing to power a Hitler vowed to shatter what was legalized at Locarno.

Professionals here hope fervently that something like this will not ultimately prove to be the real outcome of Geneva (whether it be immediately perceived or not) or at the Foreign Ministers meetings. Germany could remain cut in two and the satellite peoples continue to suffer under the Red yoke. But meanwhile a sort of "security system" (broached by the Soviets, but amended by the British) might "legalize"— for a year and a day — the "peace which is no peace" as laid down at Yalta in 1945.

Professionals were appalled to note news photos of Ambassador "Chip" Bohlen, leaning over Mr. Eisenhower's shoulder at Geneva. They recall how he leaned over Roosevelt's shoulder at Yalta. Bohlen was one of the principal "diplomatic technicians" who shaped and prepared the groundwork of that famous sellout in 1945. Diplomatic people here wonder why a "new team" of technicians was not sent to Geneva — one headed, for instance, by former Ambassador Loy Henderson, now Deputy Undersecretary of State. Henderson consistently opposed the appeasement-of-Russia policy symbolized by Yalta.

Not Merely Gossip: Senator George, the keystone of the "bipartisan" policy in the Senate, has drawn sharp hostility from Republican leaders for something — so far unpublicized — to which George got the President to agree. According to exclusive information given to HUMAN EVENTS, George persuaded President Eisenhower to promise to name as a U.S. representative to the UN none other than left-winger Ben Cohen — famous member of the team of Corcoran and Cohen, who framed the Supreme Court packing scheme of Roosevelt in 1937. Cohen is classified as a "liberal" in foreign policy. When news of the George-Eisenhower agreement on appointing Cohen got to GOP leaders, the latter hit the ceiling and went to Eisenhower and expostulated with him. The President, after listening to them, said he would reconsider the appointment.

Democratic Hopes: The spirits of the Democrats which suffered badly at the removal of Senator Lyndon Johnson from the presidential nomination picture (as a result of his illness) have perked up considerably in the past fortnight.

For one thing, Adlai Stevenson — regarded by hopeful Republicans as their adversary again in 1956 — has begun to fade conspicuously. The boom for Adlai has never been taken too seriously — at least privately — by prominent Democratic leaders. They have never liked him, and they welcomed a situation when Adlai would be "out in front" too soon.

Indeed, those who know their way around the councils of the Democratic Party say that Democratic leaders purposely gave lip service to the Adlai cause, for just this reason: to place him "out in front" where he would display such evident shortcomings that the party would have to shelve him for someone else ere long. Indeed, it is believed that former President Harry Truman—who never liked Stevenson — designed this "get rid of him" policy and sold it to the leaders.

Another reason for a firming of Democratic morale — the heads of the party have found another leader, not a candidate, but a political leader of prime stature who can design strategy and "create" the suitable candidate to oppose the GOP

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

next year. That man is Carmine DeSapio, Tammany boss, whose handling of a recent TV press interview sent Democratic Headquarters into raptures and made some GOP politicos justifiably apprehensive.

In the press, DeSapio appears as the man behind Governor Harriman (which he certainly is) and as the proponent of Harriman for President — which he is for the time being. It was noteworthy that DeSapio mentioned a number of persons besides Harriman as possible Democratic candidates in '56 — including Governor Frank Lausche of Ohio. (This column on January 8, 1955 reported that the Tammany boss had sought — at a private dinner — the opinions of Democratic leaders as to the eligibility of the Ohio Governor for the top place in the party next year.)

DeSapio's "footwork" inspires intense admiration among professional politicians. Last year, at the November New York election, he accomplished two things at one doublecross: (1) He stabbed Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., in the back, thus removing him, perhaps permanently, from the political scene, to the profit of the Democratic Party. (2) At the same time, he helped elect Republican Jacob K. Javits to the position of Attorney General of the state over Roosevelt, thereby presenting the Republican Party in New York with a very thorny problem. Javits is classified as even further Left than Senator Lehman and the prospect of backing Javits either for Senator or Governor embarrasses greatly up-state GOP politicians who want none of the man. The GOP in New York, as the phrase goes, is "shot to hell," partly as a result of the clever maneuvers of the Tammany boss.

Also recently, DeSapio again showed his double-punch technique. He named (through Harriman) a Negro, Judge Stevens, to the Supreme Bench of the Empire State. That further rivets the Negro vote to the Democratic Party. But, at the same time, Judge Stevens is also a prominent Roman Catholic and his appointment is part and parcel of the DeSapio scheme to woo back the Catholic vote to the Democratic fold in 1956. That vote, in large part, went for Eisenhower in 1952. Since the McCarthy episode, it has moved away from the Republicans and last fall by "staying at home" served to defeat GOP Senator Ives for the governorship. The DeSapio strategy, it is said, is aimed at making this powerful bloc Democratic again.

Democrats in the Capital believe that DeSapio "has something" in his backing of Harriman for the presidential nomination. For one thing, Harriman is more acceptable, or at least less unacceptable, to the Southern Democrats. The latter know too much about Stevenson and dislike him to the point of opposing him if he runs again. They don't know much about Ave and many Southern politicos have persuaded themselves that DeSapio (whom they consider fundamentally a conservative Democrat) will "keep him in line."

Bricker Amendment: A striking case, decided very recently in New York, illumines the danger of treaty law to the law of the United States and highlights the necessity of the Bricker amendment, which seeks to place the Constitution over any foreign legal intrusion into justice in U. S. Courts.

The "Review of Legal Developments," bulletin of the NAM Law Department (July 12) reports a case, *Iannone vs. Workmen's Compensation Board*, involving a claim for New York Workmen's Compensation for the death of a worker in that state. The claim was brought by the decedent's dependents, who were residents and nationals of Italy and it was recognized that these heirs deserved benefits. But normally in a case involving non-resident alien dependents, the insurance carrier may require that the New York State Board commute the present value of the award under certain actuarial tables, reduce such value by one half and pay the reduced amount in a lump sum. Such was done in this case.

However, the claimants appealed, contending that the state law is invalidated by a treaty between the U. S. and Italy which provides that nationals of either country "should be accorded rights and privileges no less favorable than those accorded to the nationals of the other." This argument was made under the Constitution's "supremacy clause" which declares that the Constitution and federal laws and treaties "shall be the supreme law of the land."

As a result, the appellant's contention was not opposed by the New York State Compensation Board and was accepted by the court. The court

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

set aside the one-half award and ordered the Board to apply the treaty instead of New York law and to give a full award. The National Association of Manufacturers' Law Department cites this as "an excellent example of the ease with which state laws on domestic matters can be superseded by treaties, and the consequent need for constitutional amendment along the lines of that proposed by Senator Bricker (R., Ohio)."

Labor Front: When Truman in 1952, under the prodding of the labor bosses, declared that under the Constitution he had the power to seize the steel mills, one courageous labor leader (Shields, head of the powerful Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers) roared his unequivocal dissent. Shields pointed out that if Truman could seize steel mills he could also seize unions (and their treasuries) and that no President should have that kind of power in the United States.

Latest Labor statesman is George Q. Lynch, President of the Patternmakers League, a national union of 14,000 highly skilled craftsmen. According to a news story by John Herling, Lynch has grave doubts about the benefits of the AFL-CIO merger to labor. He deplores the lack of discussion in various labor journals about it. The discussion which did appear, says Lynch, was "the usual generalities and standard jargon about the virtues of unity and the strength which will arise out of bigness and concentrated effort." He continues, "there is no special virtue or lack of virtue inherent in one big labor union which would not also attach to one big business, one big educational organization, one big political party or one big sectarian theology. With bigness comes a concentration of power and with that power comes abuse. There has been no exception to that rule throughout the known history of men."

As Mr. Lynch sees it, the AFL is already too big for its own good without seeking a merger with the CIO. He says there has been no serious debate (in AFL councils) on any subject and no real contest for any office in the past twenty years and that has been as bad for the Federation as it would be bad for the U.S. Congress or the British Parliament.

Distorting the Bible: Katherine St. George, Republican Congresswoman, is aroused by what she terms "the distorted, inaccurate and at times quite disgusting interpretation of Bible stories by Hollywood." She cites an article in the *Christian Herald* by J. C. Furnas on this subject with approval. Some Furnas comments:

"Just as crime movies are 98 percent glorification of felons and 2 percent hurried crime-doesn't-pay at the end, so Bible movies run pretty solid honky-tonk sex and comic book violence, barely remembering to conclude with a sickly religiosity.

"That Damascene orgy of the Prodigal's is likely to spoil the chance of any Christian youngsters ever to know the spiritual content of the lovely old parable. That movie version of King David's affair with Susan Hayward would go far to numb many teenagers to the ethical values of the career of the son of Jesse.

"Organized religion now includes 95,000,000 Americans. Suppose only a third of them decided to stay home with television when the local theatre runs a Bible picture cheapening things holy in their eyes. Suppose suburban church-goers seeing garish Bible films in first run theatres in the big city put warning notes about them into Church bulletins before they appear in local theatres.

"Ministers might find a sermon in the thesis that one learns more of sacred things studying for oneself the gospel text of the story of John the Baptist than by watching Rita Hayworth as Salome."

Letter from CHARLES COBURN, Star of Stage and Screen: "I have been a subscriber to HUMAN EVENTS for some time, and I find it a beacon on important political matters."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER
HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor, and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.
Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. **Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XII, No. 30 HUMAN EVENTS July 23, 1955

Article Section

HINDSIGHT, FORESIGHT AND BLIND SIGHT

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

THOSE WHO AS POLITICIANS or publicists bear some share of responsibility for the botched foreign policy of the Roosevelt Administration have a standard retort when the disastrous consequences of Yalta and other appeasement deals with Stalin are pointed out. Such criticism, they declare, is based on "hindsight." It is implied, or openly stated, that the critics are showing a cheap after-the-event wisdom, that there was no alternative at the time to the courses which were followed.

As the events of wartime diplomacy recede into the perspective of history, it becomes clearer that the conspicuous blunders of Roosevelt's political conduct of the war can all be traced to one master illusion. This was that the Soviet Union under its Communist rulers would be a trustworthy, reliable, peace-minded associate in the reconstruction of the world after the end of the war.

Had there not been this central blind spot of illusion, it is scarcely conceivable that some of the blunders of detail could have been or would have been committed. The ruling out of all diplomatic flexibility by the vainglorious "Unconditional Surrender" demand; the permanent industrial desolation of Germany contemplated under the Morgenthau Plan; the failure to seize Berlin and Prague in the closing weeks of the war or to divert to the Balkans the forces which were wasted in a useless landing in Southern France — these mistakes all stemmed from the one big error: that the Soviet Communist dictatorship was a trustworthy ally and that Soviet penetration of the heart of Europe could be viewed with complacency.

The same observation holds true for the concessions in Manchuria and elsewhere at Nationalist China's expense that were fatuously made to bribe Stalin to enter the war in the Far East; and for the failure to consider the possibility of a quick peace with Japan which would have eliminated the necessity for the Soviet intervention in the Orient that opened up a Pandora's Box of calamities, including the Communist conquest of China and the war in Korea.

Now when it is glibly asserted, as it was in the war years, as it still is by diehard apologists for Yalta like Walter Lippmann, that there was no alternative to the policy of Soviet appeasement that was followed, two questions may fairly be asked. First, did the Soviet record before Yalta suggest

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that a dominant position for the Soviet Government in Europe and Asia would promote the interests and security of the United States? Second, were voices of warning raised, pointing to the probable grave consequences of acquiescing in and sometimes underwriting the annexationist ambitions of a regime with the unlimited aspiration for world domination that is inherent in international Communism? The answer to the first question is an emphatic No. The answer to the second question is an equally definite Yes. Let's look at the record.

BEFORE THE YALTA CONFERENCE, which took place early in February, 1945, there were no less than eight major actions of the Soviet Government, well-known to official Washington, which should have inspired the gravest doubts as to Soviet intentions and good faith.

(1) The Soviet Government, after posing as an irreconcilable enemy of Fascism, signed a pact with Nazi Germany on August 23, 1939, which cynically divided up Eastern Europe between Communist and Nazi tyranny.

(2) In violation of a pact of non-aggression between the two countries, the Soviet Red Army invaded Poland in September, 1939. The Soviet authorities behaved with the utmost brutality in the part of Poland which was annexed, deporting over a million men, women and children to slave labor under such bad physical conditions that about a quarter of them perished.

(3) In violation of similar treaties, the Soviet Union overran and annexed the small Baltic Republics, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, in 1940. There was a repetition of the mass deportations which had been practiced in Poland.

(4) Again in violation of a non-aggression treaty, the Soviet Government attacked Finland on November 30, 1939, fought an aggressive war for three and a half months and annexed about one-tenth of Finland's territory, land that was historically and ethnically Finnish.

(5) The Soviet Government, even when it received increasing amounts of American and British aid after Hitler's attack in 1941, consistently refused to consider making good the wrongs that had been inflicted on Poland and the Baltic States.

(6) The Soviet Government, with characteristic cynicism, took the exposure of one of its own most revolting "war crimes," the massacre of some fifteen thousand Polish officer war prisoners in the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, and elsewhere as an excuse for breaking off diplomatic relations with the legitimate government of Poland. This occurred in the spring of 1943; from this time the Soviet Government intensified its efforts to impose on Poland a Red Quisling regime, dominated by Communists.

(7) When the Red Army approached the Polish capital, Warsaw, in the summer of 1944, the Soviet radio broadcast appeals in Polish for an uprising. When the Polish underground forces, nationalist in political sympathy, went into action against the German garrison the Red Army stood still and the revolt was suppressed with fright-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ful loss of life, accompanied by the complete destruction of the city of Warsaw.

(8) After overrunning Bulgaria in 1944 the Soviet authorities took care to shut out the United States and the other Western powers from any effective voice in the negotiation of a Bulgarian peace settlement. This was in line with the general Soviet policy of setting up puppet Communist-dominated regimes in every country "liberated" by the Red Army.

Surely these were "Stop, Look and Listen" signs which should have been heeded by American negotiators at Yalta.

AND, CONTRARY TO A LEGEND spread by the Roosevelt apologists, there was no lack of warning voices, voices of foresight, not "hindsight," about the dangers of associating the American Republic with Communist tyranny in a phony crusade for the Four Freedoms and the Atlantic Charter. On June 29, 1941, former President Hoover said, and he could scarcely have been more right in his prediction:

"If we go further and join the war, and we win, then we have won for Stalin the grip of Communism on Russia and more opportunity for it to extend over the world."

Senator Robert A. Taft was equally foresighted and farsighted. Here is an excerpt from his radio address of June 25, 1941:

"In the name of democracy we are to make a Communist alliance with the most ruthless dictator in the world. But the victory of Communism in the world would be far more dangerous to the United States than the victory of Fascism. There has never been the slightest danger that the people of this country would ever embrace Bundism or Nazism . . . . But Communism masquerades often successfully under the guise of democracy, although just as alien to our real principles as Nazism itself."

Senator Styles Bridges, as early as September 12, 1943, was calling for "more spine and less servility" in dealing with the Soviets. And Senator Bridges challenged the whole appeasement policy when he said in the Senate on January 14, 1944:

"Americans want to know whether the national life and independence of any people in Europe — whether in the Baltic region, the Balkans or Western Europe — have been endangered by American commitments or the failure to make strong American representations. Americans want to know how Poland, which was the only full ally England and France had at the beginning of the war and which has been so horribly ravaged, is to be rewarded for its loyalty and supreme sacrifices."

HUMAN EVENTS can point to a record of foresight, not hindsight and not the blind sight of the internationalist crusaders. In the issue of February 21, 1945, immediately after the contents of the Yalta Agreement were partially revealed, Felix Morley branded as attempted deception the inclusion in the Yalta statement of affirmation of faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, in an article entitled "For Yalta, Read Munich."

This writer can look back to a piece which he contributed to HUMAN EVENTS,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Shadows of the Holy Alliance" (issue of March 21, 1945) as an accurate analysis of the causes of the failure of the embryonic United Nations. An article on "European 'Settlements,'" of October 3, 1945, points to the unjust boundary settlements and the mass deportations in Europe as "a far cry from the principles of national self-determination, equality of economic opportunity and ultimate disarmament in the Atlantic Charter, and from the lip service paid to freedom and democracy in the Moscow, Yalta and Potsdam declarations."

AMERICAN NATIONALISTS, sometimes misrepresented as isolationists, have nothing to be ashamed of in their estimates of the world situation, as the foregoing citations, and many others which could be added, show. The people who have been consistently wrong have been the crusading internationalists who got the country into two wars in pursuit of vague idealistic goals which most emphatically were not realized in the Treaty of Versailles, still less in the decisions of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. It is among them that one must look for the true "illustrious dunderheads," to toss back a phrase which a writer of detective stories, Rex Stout — transformed overnight into a self-esteemed expert on foreign affairs — applied to conservative American nationalists.

The list of their mistakes is too long to be covered up, even though this group is in control of a disproportionately large share of organs of mass communication and public opinion. They exaggerated the danger from Hitler and they displayed a pathetic blind sight in regard to the danger from Stalin. In diplomacy and in war, they muffed one opportunity after another.

They were wrong in placing UN ahead of U.S., in regarding the United Nations as the cornerstone of American foreign policy. They were wrong in considering France, in the light of its showing in the Second World War and in the war in Indo-China, as a bastion of American defense and pouring billions of dollars into the French sieve. They were wrong in hastily and almost gloatingly writing off Nationalist China. They were wrong in denying to American soldiers, fighting against big numerical odds in Korea, the full backing of American air and nuclear power. They were wrong in accepting German rearmament, if they accepted it at all, very halfheartedly.

It is not only for the sake of historical accuracy that the record of who showed foresight and who showed blind sight should be set right. For the man who once justified and still justifies Yalta will usually rise like a trout to the bait of Soviet appeasement and neutralism. Those who have been proved wrong so often in the past are not reliable guides for the future, whether their sphere is politics or the molding of public opinion.

Additional Copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25.
Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED